



JAMES A. NOYES, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

November 27, 2002

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: PD-3

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2756

Dear Supervisors:

**CANON VIEW TRAIL
IN THE UNINCORPORATED LOS ANGELES COUNTY
NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 3
3 VOTES**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the enclosed Negative Declaration for the Canon View Trail retaining wall project, concur that the project with the proposed mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and approve the Negative Declaration.
2. Adopt the enclosed Reporting Program to ensure compliance with the project and conditions adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.
3. Approve the project, and authorize Public Works to carry out the project.
4. Find that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on wildlife resources, and authorize Public Works to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the proposed project is to prevent surficial sliding and to stabilize the downhill slope at the easterly edge of the roadway. The project will provide enhanced safety for local residents and motorists using the road.

The proposed project involves the construction of a new retaining wall in front of the existing retaining wall that is located along the back property line of House No. 542 Canon View Trail. It will be comprised of soldier beam piles with prestressed concrete panels. The total length of the wall will be approximately 135 feet with a concrete panel height of about 10 feet. Approximately 83 feet of berm will also be reconstructed. The project also includes resurfacing the roadway at both Canon View Trail and Circle Trail.

An environmental impact analysis/documentation is a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental impacts of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, we are also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of the CEQA.

The Initial Study of Environmental Factors indicated that proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines adopted by your Board on November 17, 1987, a Negative Declaration (ND) was prepared and circulated for public review.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County's Strategic Plan Goal of Service Excellence as this action will allow us to improve and maintain a portion of the regional roadway system, thereby improving the quality of life in the County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There will be no impact to the County's general fund, sufficient funds for the proposed project are included in the Fiscal Year 2002-03 Road Construction Program.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under the CEQA, any lead agency preparing an ND must provide a public notice within a reasonable period of time prior to certification of the ND. To comply with this requirement, a Public Notice pursuant to Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code was published in the Los Angeles Daily News on October 10, 2002. Copies of the ND were sent to the Encino-Tarzana and Palisades Libraries for public review. Notices were also mailed to residents in the vicinity of the project. No comments were received during the public review period.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, the ND determined that the project with necessary mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the ND is requested at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

CEQA requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implications of their action.

Mitigation measures have been included as part of the project. We have prepared the enclosed Reporting and Monitoring Program that includes maintaining records to ensure compliance with environmental mitigation measures adopted as part of this project. Your Board is being asked to approve and authorize Public Works to carry out this project.

A fee must be paid to the State Department of Fish and Game when certain notices required by the CEQA are filed with the County Clerk. The County is exempt from paying this fee when the Board finds that a project will have no impacts on wildlife resources. The Initial Study of Environmental Factors concluded there will be no adverse effects on wildlife resources. Upon approval of the ND by your Board, Public Works will file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk. A \$25 handling fee will be paid to the County Clerk for processing. We will also file a Notice of Determination in accordance with the requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
November 27, 2002
Page 4

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project would improve and rehabilitate the deteriorated retaining wall and appurtenant structures within the project area.

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to Public Works.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

SDS:ph
C020898
A:\Canonviewtrail.wpd

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

**PROGRAM FOR REPORTING AND MONITORING THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
MITIGATION MEASURES
CANON VIEW TRAIL
RETAINING WALL**

The following program will be used to monitor and implement the mitigation measures discussed in Section XVIII of the Negative Declaration.

1.0 Program Management

- 1.1 After adoption of environmental mitigation measures by the Board of Supervisors, the Department of Public Works shall designate responsibility for monitoring and reporting compliance with each mitigation measure.
- 1.2 To facilitate implementation and enforcement of this program, Public Works shall ensure that the obligation to monitor and report compliance with environmental mitigation measures is required by all project-related contracts between the County and consultant, prime construction contractor, and any other person or entity who is designated to monitor and/or report compliance under this program during the preconstruction and construction phases.
- 1.3 Public Works, as appropriate, shall take all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that each project-related environmental mitigation measure, which was adopted, is implemented and maintained.

2.0 Preconstruction

- 2.1 Public Works or consultant for project design is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures into project design and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.
- 2.2 Public Works or consultant for design of project-related off-site improvements is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.

3.0 **Construction**

- 3.1 Public Works or prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for constructing and/or monitoring the construction of mitigation measures incorporated in final construction documents and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.
- 3.2 Public Works or prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for implementation and/or monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures affecting methods and practices of construction (e.g., hours of operation, noise control of machinery) and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.
- 3.3 Public Works is responsible for monitoring compliance of prime construction contractor(s) with responsibility set forth in 3.1 and 3.2 above and reporting noncompliance in writing.

4.0 **Project Operation**

- 4.1 After completion and final acceptance of the project, Public Works is responsible for monitoring and maintaining compliance with adopted mitigation measures, which affect project operation.

SDS:ph

A:\Canonviewtrail.wpd

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
CANON VIEW TRAIL

1. Location and Brief Description

Description of Project: The proposed project is located in the Topanga area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory approximately four miles north of the City of Malibu (see attached map). The proposed project involves the construction of a new retaining wall in front of the existing retaining wall that is located along the back property line of House No. 542 Canon View Trail. It will be comprised of soldier beam piles with prestressed concrete panels. The total length of the wall will be approximately 135 feet with a concrete panel height of about 10 feet. Approximately 83 feet of berm will also be reconstructed. The project also includes resurfacing the roadway at both Canon View Trail and Circle Trail.

The purpose of the proposed project is to prevent surficial sliding and to stabilize the downhill slope at the easterly edge of the roadway. The project will provide increased safety for local residents and motorists using the road.

The proposed improvements would not require right-of-way acquisition.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant environmental effects were identified. However, mitigation measures are discussed in Section XVIII of the Initial Study.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

SDS:la
PD-3/A:\Canonviewtrail.wpd

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Canon View Trail
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ms. Sarah D. Scott, (626) 458-3916
4. **Project Location:** Monte Nido area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
6. **General Plan Designation:** Non-Urban Expansion
7. **Zoning:** Non-Urban Residential Development
8. **Description of Project:** The proposed project is located in the Topanga area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory approximately four miles north of the City of Malibu. The proposed project involves the construction of a new retaining wall in front of the existing retaining wall that is located along the back property line of House No. 542 Canon View Trail. It will be comprised of soldier beam piles with prestressed concrete panels. The total length of the wall will be approximately 135 feet with a concrete panel height of about 10 feet. Approximately 83 feet of berm will also be reconstructed. The project also includes resurfacing the roadway at both Canon View Trail and Circle Trail.
9. **Surrounding Land Use and Settings:**
 - a. **Project Site** -The project site is steep terrain. Vegetation consists mainly of shrubs and three oak trees less than eight inches in diameter. Animal life consists of lizards, birds, insects, and wildlife. House No. 542 Canon View Trail is located approximately 15 feet downhill of the proposed retaining wall.
 - b. **Surrounding Properties** -The area surrounding the project site is rural with few residential properties surrounding the proposed project site. The vegetation in surrounding area consists of shrubs, a few oak trees, and grass.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):**
 - a. California Coastal Commission - Coastal Development Permit

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ Signature	_____ September 3, 2002 Date
_____ Sarah D. Scott Printed Name	_____ LACDPW For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

CANON VIEW TRAIL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?				X
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
	iv)	Landslides?			X	
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X	
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:						
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:						
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Physically divide an established community?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:						
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:						
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u> -						
	a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
		Fire protection?				X
		Police protection?				X
		Schools?				X
		Parks?				X
		Other public facilities?				X
XIV. <u>RECREATION</u> -						
	a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?				X
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
	g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -						
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS -

Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified. However, the following mitigation measures have been included:

Air Quality

- Control dust by appropriate means such as watering and/or sweeping.
- Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Geology and Soils

- Proper removal and disposal of excess soils and excavated materials.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Proper maintenance of all construction equipment.
- Compliance with all applicable laws and ordinances regarding chemical cleanup.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Compliance with all applicable Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Noise

- Compliance with all applicable noise and ordinances during construction.
- Construction activities would be restricted to the County appointed construction times.

Transportation/Traffic

- I. Advance notification of all street and/or lane closures and detours to all emergency service agencies.
 - II. Clear delineations and barricades to designate through-traffic lanes.
- Compliance with all applicable laws and ordinances regarding the transportation routes for the haul of material.

ATTACHMENT A
DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS
CANON VIEW TRAIL

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact. This area does not represent a unique scenic vista within the Topanga area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse impacts on scenic vistas.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

No impact. The proposed project will not affect scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historical buildings within a State scenic highway. Thus, the project will have no impact on a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project consists of constructing a new retaining wall in front of an existing retaining wall. During construction of the proposed project, the impact of these activities will be apparent to a few residents. These impacts will be temporary, lasting only through the duration of construction. Following construction, the wall will be visible to area residents.

However, the project will only slightly alter the previous characteristics of the project area. Thus, no significant adverse visual impacts are anticipated to occur from the implementation of the project.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No impact. The proposed project would not include additional lighting systems or propose structures that could result in glare. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:*

- a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project location is not used for agricultural purposes or as farmland. Therefore, the project will not convert any farmland to nonagricultural use. Thus, the project will have no impact on farmland.

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***

No impact. There is no active agriculture and no Williamson Act in the project area. Thus, the proposed project will not impact any existing zoning for agricultural uses or cancellation of Williamson Act contracts.

- c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY - *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:*

- a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No impact. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Management Plan. The proposed project will not conflict with current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities are anticipated to occur from 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with applicable air pollution regulations. When transporting excess excavated material, the contractor would be required to cover material with a tarp to reduce dust emissions and prevent falling debris. The impacts would be temporary and considered less than significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No impact. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with all Federal and Air Quality Management District emission control regulations. The proposed project construction will not lead to emissions which exceed thresholds for ozone precursors. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on ambient air quality standards.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than significant impact. Sensitive receptors in the area may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emission during project construction. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations. The impact is considered to be less than significant since the exposure would be temporary and precautions will be taken to mitigate exposure to pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated from various equipment during construction activities. These types of odor would be short-term and temporary. Thus, the impact of creating objectionable odor is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project site does not support any riparian habitat. However, the proposed project will impact three oak trees less than eight inches in diameter, some grass, and shrubs. No adverse effect on any species is expected. Thus, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. There is no riparian habitat at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

No impact. The site does not provide important corridors for wildlife movement or nursery opportunities. Therefore, there will be no impact on resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less than significant impact. No significant biological resources were identified on the project site. The site is not within a Significant Ecological Area as defined by Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. The proposed project will impact three oak trees less than eight inches in diameter. However, according to Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance, the removal of oak trees within unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, that are less than eight inches in diameter, does not require an oak tree permit. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact and will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan?

No impact. No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a-d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?

No impact. No known paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources exist in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor shall cease excavation and contact a specialist to examine the project sites as required by project specifications. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources are not considered significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No impact. There are no known active faults underlying the project site and we do not anticipate a fault rupture occurring at the project site.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No impact. The proposed construction of the retaining wall would protect the slope from future landslides. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in significant adverse impacts related strong seismic ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction nor is it identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?

Less than significant impact. The area is potentially susceptible to landslides during seismic activities. The proposed project is being considered in response to cracks in the retaining wall at House Number 542. Implementation of the proposed project would reduce the potential for landslides at the site. Thus, the proposed project will not result in significant adverse impacts related to landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than significant impact. The project site is on a steep slope where erosion could occur during periods of heavy precipitation. Construction of the retaining wall will greatly reduce the potential for future erosion at the site. Other control measures would involve placing pervious material at the back of the retaining wall in accordance with Caltrans standards with weep holes at the center of each concrete panel. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on the loss of top soil or soil erosion would be considered less than significant.

- c) ***Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will reduce potential future impacts associated with landslides at the site to below a level of significance. No significant adverse impacts related to liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse are anticipated. The project will have a beneficial impact by reducing the potential for future landslides on the site. Thus, the project will have a less than significant impact on unstable soil or geologic unit.

- d) ***Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?***

No impact. The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

- e) ***Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

No impact. There are no septic tanks or sewer pipes at the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

- a) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b-c) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact. Combustible engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances will occur

as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup and, if necessary, any nearby school officials would be notified of the spill and any precautions to be taken. Thus, the proposed project impact on the public or environment is considered less than significant.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

No impact. The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project area is not within an airport land use plan and is not within a two-mile radius of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact relating to a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less than significant impact. During construction, access will be permitted at all times. The project specifications will require the contractor to maintain emergency access at all times during construction. Also, the project specifications will require the contractor to give advance notice of all street closures and detours to all emergency service agencies. Therefore, the impact on the proposed project emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is considered less than significant.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to any significant risks involving wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in adverse impacts related to risks associated with wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

Less than significant impact. The contractor is required to implement Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to minimize construction impacts on water quality. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not deplete groundwater nor interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the local groundwater table.

- c-d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. Although the proposed retaining wall will be constructed in front of the existing wall, the overall drainage pattern would remain unchanged. The construction activities would slightly change the topography but would not alter the present flow patterns. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on erosion, siltation, or on the rate or amount of surface runoff.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

Less than significant impact. The project would slightly increase the amount of impermeable surface area. However, the construction of the project will not result in significant additional surface water runoff. Construction is scheduled during dry periods. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems is considered less than significant.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

No impact. The contractor will adhere to applicable Best Management Practices to minimize any degradation to water quality during construction. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact or degrade water quality.

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. Existing flood hazards are established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map¹, Community-Panel No. 065043 0783 B, the proposed project site is located in Flood Hazard Zone "C." A Flood Hazard Zone "C" is defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as an area of minimal flooding. Implementation of the proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which may impede or redirect flood flows.

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

¹ Community-Panel Number 065043 0783 B dated December 2, 1980

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No impact. The proposed project will not cause any inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The proposed project will not physically divide the community. Therefore, the project will have no impact on physically dividing an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any of the agencies with jurisdiction.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project :

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

No impact. The construction of the proposed project would not deplete any known mineral resources. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No impact. The project site is not identified as a mineral resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County noise control ordinances. Overall, since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels. Thus, the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Less than significant impact. There are no existing or planned uses on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations. Although some groundborne vibrations are expected to be generated from the equipment that may be used during construction of the proposed project, the impact associated with this vibration will be short term and below a level of significance. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in significant adverse impacts related to exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels.

- c-d) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less than significant impact. As previously discussed, during the construction phase of the project, there will be a nominal increase in existing noise levels. However, the proposed project contains no noise-generating features. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact will be less than significant.

- e-f) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

- a) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

No impact. Construction of the proposed project is not expected to result in population growth in the area, directly or indirectly.

- b-c) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses or people, which would create a demand for housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE

- a) ***Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

No impact. The purpose of the proposed project is to prevent surficial sliding and to stabilize the downhill slope at the easterly edge of the roadway. The project will provide increased safety for local residents and motorists using the road. Thus, the project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. However, the County will coordinate with the police and fire departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project may require disposal of excavated material and transportation of construction equipment to the project site. Project specifications would require the contractor to determine the number of trucks per day and the number of days of transport within the allotted construction period. The contractor would notify residents in advance of any closure or restrictions on access to their properties during construction. Necessary safety precautionary measures such as posting signs or use of a flagperson to direct traffic would be provided as needed. This impact is only during construction and, thus, is temporary and short-lived. Therefore, any increase to traffic would be considered less than significant.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The minor increase in traffic in the project area due to construction vehicles is temporary. Overall, the proposed project will not directly or indirectly cause traffic to exceed a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for roads or highways in the project area.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazards. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hazards due to design features.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

Less than significant impact. The presence of construction equipment may slow down traffic; however, emergency access will be maintained at all times. The contractor will be required to notify all emergency facilities and emergency service providers of any road closure. Since the project will be completed within a short period, the impacts from slight increase in traffic delay due to construction vehicles are temporary and short-lived. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on emergency access is considered less than significant.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

No impact. No impact to parking capacity is expected.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities. The existing drainage facilities will accommodate the proposed construction.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No impact. No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

- f-g) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No impact. Construction of the proposed project may result in excess excavated materials and construction debris. However, the amount of solid waste generated will be minimal. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of these materials in accordance to all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. The proposed project will not result in a facility that would generate solid waste. Therefore, there will be no impact on landfill capacity.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

Less than significant impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on plant community is considered less than significant.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)***

No impact. The proposed project is designed to prevent surficial sliding and to stabilize the downhill slope at the easterly edge of the roadway. The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

No impact. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.